

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/806,301	07/27/2001	Roberto A. Macina	DEX-0188 8552	
26259 7:	590 09/29/2004		EXAMINER .	
LICATLA & TYRRELL P.C.			HOLLERAN, ANNE L	
66 E. MAIN ST MARLTON, N			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1642	
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/806,301	MACINA, ROBERTO) A.
/ laviosity / loadin	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anne Holleran	1642	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	to a tion in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offict timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final (on. See MPEP priate extension priate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further	,	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	3.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by th	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer 10. Other:	WW. Maraja	HARRIS, PH.D. RY, EXAMINER	•
	~Y &	~ (~00 /	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments and evidence (Carter et al document) presented are not commensurate in scope with the scope of the claimed invention. The claimed invention is drawn to a method of detecting any change in ESPBII protein levels for the purpose of detecting prostate, urterine or ovarian cancer, whereas the arguments and evidence are directed to methods where a detection of an increase in ESBPII levels are used for the purpose of detecting prostate, uterine or ovarian cancer. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.